

**ORIGINAL**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF OREGON

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG,)
Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. CV - 08 - 1496 - BR
v.)
INTEL CORPORATION,)
Defendant,) AMENDED COMPLAINT
v.) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
STEVE JOBS,)
Third Party Defendant.) REQUEST EXTRODINARY HEARING

CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT BROUGHT UNDER
TITLE 18 USC § 1028, TITLE 15 USC § 1713
TITLE 28 USC § 1338, § 1343, AND § 2201 CREATING
A REMEDY FOR PROPERTY IN CONTROVERCY
FRCP RULE B, C, D, AND E ACTION IN REM,
QUASI IN REM, IN PERSONAM, ACTION IN PERSONAM
CLAIMING VIOLATION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
INFRINGEMENT OF A PATENTABLE INVENTION, AND
COPYRIGHTABLE WORK, TRADE SECERTS AND UNFAIR
COMPETITION OF THE COMMERCIALLY VALUABLE PRODUCT
PRO SE PLAINTIFF SEEKS OR DEMANDS COMPENSATION
OF FIVE BILLION DOLLARS [5,000,000,000.00] AND SEEKS A
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

THIS IS a pro se complaint, brought under the laws governing Intellectual Property Rights protected by the laws implemented by Congress to protect a category of intangible rights protecting commercially valuable products of the human intellect. The category comprises primarily Trademark, Copyright, and Patent rights, but also includes trade-secret rights, publicity rights, moral rights, and rights against unfair competition, and a commercially valuable product of the human intellect, in a concrete or abstract form, such as a copyrightable work, a protectable trademark, and a patentable invention, or a trade secret. **THIS complaint** incorporates the action quasi in rem; an action brought against the defendant personally, with jurisdiction based on an interest in property, the objective being to deal with the particular property or to subject the property to discharge of the claims asserted. And action in rem.

The predominant Federal Statute relied upon for Jurisdictional grounds in this civil action is **Title 28 U.S.C. § 1338**, with focus at *[Protection of DESIGNS]*, and *[Unfair competition]*

COMPLAINT

1) Pro se plaintiff, Matthew Robert Young, is a State prisoner confined in the Oregon Department of Corrections, Snake River Correctional Institution, located at 777 Stanton Blvd., in Ontario, OR 97914. Pro se plaintiff herein invokes his Constitutional Rights as a Citizen of the United States of America, to bring this civil action, action in rem, in quasi rem, in personam, as an action in personam as allowed pursuant to **FRCP Rule B, C, D, and E** and further as provided by **Title 28 USC § 2201** allowing for the creation of a remedy in a case of an actual controversy over personal property as provided by and allowed under **Title 28 USC § 1338**, in the form of personal intellectual property that is a Trade Secret Right of a commercially valuable product created from pro se plaintiff's intellectual property design of an abstract patentable, and

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

copyrightable invention and works. Pro se plaintiff further claims that these Acts were committed in violation of his clearly established federally protected Constitutional Rights Against lawful seizure of his personal property, under the **Fourth [4th]**, and **fourteenth [14th]** **Amendments** to the Constitution of the United States. Pro se plaintiff seeks and demands **Five Billion [\$5,000,000,000.00] dollars** compensation from **Intel corporation** for receiving of his stolen personal property, transporting of his personal property in the interstate commerce, the aiding in actual concealing of his personal property, and withholding of stolen goods from their rightful owner, even **AFTER** Intel Corporation had been made aware with full knowledge, that pro se plaintiff is the rightful owner, and original inventor of these commercially valuable products, **Therefore** pro se plaintiff prays that the United States District Court will Issue a Judgment Awarding pro se plaintiff the sum demanded above. Pro se plaintiff notes for the purpose of Legal factual contentions that the act of receiving stolen property, as prescribed pursuant to the laws under **66 Am. Jur. 2d** on receiving stolen property that it is not necessary that **Intel Corporation** be in manual possession or touching of the stolen goods, that any exercising of control or dominion over them is sufficient to constitute a receiving. For this cause pro se plaintiff claims unfair competition, theft of personal property, concealment of personal property, fraud, and monopoly, and unfair trade practice. For this purpose pro se plaintiff further seeks and prays for injunctive relief, in the form of a United States District Court, restraining Intel Corporation, and any of its subsidiaries, associates, or Business partners from seeking, making developing or in any way distributing for profit or otherwise public use, any technological computerized device, application, tool, or commercialize product that incorporates or uses in any way the **[Core-2 Duo Virtualized Technology]**.

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

2) Pro se plaintiff request pursuant to FRCP Rule 54 for Judgment of All Costs, and Court filing fees, attorney's fees, and all other cost and distributions that may incur herein.

3) This Civil Action is brought in the United States District Court located at:

United States District Court for the District of Oregon
Mark O. Hatfield U.S. Courthouse,
1000 S.W. Third Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

a) This United States District Court has Jurisdiction to hear and decide these matters and issues in controversy and to award pro se plaintiff the amount and sum sought herein pursuant to **Title 28 U.S.C. § 1332, § 1337, §1338, §1343, § 2201, § 2202**, and Pro se plaintiff reserves the right to amend this jurisdiction pursuant to **Title 28 USC § 1653**.

b) Pro se plaintiff **Matthew Robert Young** is [a citizen of Oregon]. The defendant **Intel Corporations** is [a citizen of Oregon] [a corporation incorporated under the Laws of Oregon, with its principle place of business in Oregon]. The amount in controversy is **Five Billion Dollars** [**\$ 5,000,000,000.00**] without interest and costs which exceeds the sum or value specified by **Title 28 U.S.C. § 1332**,

c) **Steve Jobs** is a [citizen of California] and here after the filing of this complaint, will be omitted as a party, until such time as **Intel corporation** moves to include him as a third party defendant, enjoining pro se plaintiff in a cause raising the claim of Fraud, and material misrepresentation with respect to information not included in the statement of property purchased or received form **Mr. Steve Jobs**.

d) The third party defendant **Steve Jobs** will hereafter be omitted as a party, in that at this time **Mr. Jobs** [is not subject to this Court's jurisdiction] and therefore cannot be made a party, without depriving this Court of subject matter jurisdiction in this cause of action, Because to the

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

best of pro se plaintiff's knowledge, **Mr. Jobs** was [a resident of the state of California] when he defrauded **Intel Corporation**, about where, and from whom he actually acquired the *Designs*, and *Schematics* from, which **Intel Corporation** actually then developed the [**Core-2 Duo, Virtual Technology**], from.

e) *Therefore it is Intel Corporation's position to enjoin pro se plaintiff in a separate action against Steve Jobs, unless this court allows Intel Corporation to do so in this civil action, pursuant to LR (Local Rules) 14 (a) – (a), Holding that a defending party, may as a third party plaintiff, cause to be served with Summons and Complaint, a person who is not a party, (which here after Steve Jobs, will be omitted as a Party) as a person liable for the plaintiff claims against the defending party. FRCP 14 (a).*

PLAINTIFF

4) **Matthew Robert Young** is the plaintiff proceeding in pro se, in this civil action, **Date of birth July 4th 1965, place of birth Albuquerque, New Mexico.** Pro se plaintiff is currently being unlawfully held and restrained of his liberty and freedom in the Snake River Correctional Institution, which is located at 777 Stanton Blvd., Ontario, OR 97914, which subject matter is currently being brought on a separate civil action in this **United States District Court, Civil No. 08-1138-PK.**

DEFENDANTS

5) **Intel Corporation** is the liable Defendant in this civil action, and is a Corporation within the jurisdiction of this United States District Court, and for the purpose of this civil action to be held liable of the laws cited and raised here. **Intel Corporation** is considered a citizen for the purpose of this civil action, and made subject to liability pursuant to **Title 28 USC §1332 (C)**

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

(1), and is located at 2111 N.E. 25th Ave., Hillsboro, OR 97124.

6) Steve Jobs is the third party defendant, and is in fact liable to Intel Corporation, he is Located in California.

QUESTIONS OF THE CHARACTER OF THE CLAIMS AND ADDMISSIBILITY OF THE NATURE AND WEIGHT OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

7) Pro se plaintiff intends to bring into focus the central characteristics of pro se plaintiff's claims as they are supported by such evidence that when viewed under the Uniform Administration of the Laws of the United States, do establish themselves as factual contentions, and further brings them within the scope of these applicable Laws, as to the sufficiency of the substance of their subject matter, as the required elements needed to establish his compliant as an appropriate pleading within the scope, and Design of Title 28 USC § 2201, providing that any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading may declare the rights of the parties and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration.

a) Pro se plaintiff's factual contentions are such that, at an evidentiary hearing pro se plaintiff will prove that there exist absolutely no opposing genuine issues of any material facts to even remotely challenge the truthfulness of their probative value.

b) Pro se plaintiff make this declaration: [THAT], *If anyone in the world today can come before this Court, at an evidentiary hearing, and present to this Court a creditable challenge, (which would be during an Evidentiary Hearing Held Before this Court, wherein All of the parties are provided time chance and the opportunity to present to this court the actual applications for these commercially valuable products)*, which are known as the [Core-2 Duo Micro Processor, and Virtual Technology], allegedly invented by Intel Corporation, then pro se plaintiff agrees to be HELD liable for the Ten Thousand Dollar [\$10,000.00] civil

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

fine fees. *But first* here is pro se plaintiff's standing upon factual contention as required in part by **FRCP Rule 11**, which pertains to [*the proprietary information, the actual trade secrets*] of the true application of the [**Core-2 Duo micro processor, and Virtual Technology**], of which **Intel Corporation** only knows the potential Applications of these Technology products, as **Intel Corporation** was provided by **Mr. Steve Jobs**, and not it true Technological *Trade Secret Designs* that will make these commercially valuable Technology products work, and perform to their *fullest ability*, and *capacities*.

c) Pro se plaintiff is the only person in the world at present who knows how to make both the [**Core-2 Duo micro processor, and the Virtual Technology**] work, and pro se plaintiff can in fact come before this U S District Court and prove it by a factual **DEMONSTRATION**.

8) Pro se plaintiff further brings this civil action under the federal jurisdiction of this U S District Court pursuant to the **Federal Rules of Evidence Rules 104 (a)(b) & (e), Rules 106, 201 (b) on kinds of facts, (d) when mandatory (e) opportunity to be heard and (f) time for taking notice; Rule 301, 302, 401, 402 and 404 FRCP Rules B, C, D and E.**

a) It is pro se plaintiff's intent to further bring into focus here, the central ideal of the characteristic of pro se plaintiff argument substantiating his claims, as they are supported by such evidence that under the uniform administration of the Laws governing, do establish his claims as factual contentions that are the subject matter, of the type of substance that is required in order to establish this complaint as an appropriate pleading that declare the Rights under the Laws that mandates other legal relations..

b) Pro se plaintiff *declares* here that this action is a **JUST** cause, and not for harassment purposes, further Pro se plaintiff makes in his *declaration* a request for this United States District

Court to **HOLD** a simple *exemplary test* under seal of this court, for this Court have pro se plaintiff brought before It to give a Demonstration for this Court in person, exactly just how the computer [Technology which Intel Corporation calls **Virtual Technology** the Micro Processor which Intel Corporation calls **core 2 – DUO**], works and to seal this *proprietary information* which pro se plaintiff will Demonstrate for this Court, to be products that were in fact Developed, Manufactured, and Built from pro se plaintiff's personal intellectual property to which **ONLY** pro se plaintiff's Holds the **FULL** Knowledge of the [*proprietary information trade secret.*]

c) pro se plaintiff, further request that this United States District Court Order that Intel Corporation bring in it's *best and brightest engineers*, Before this Court under the same sealed Hearing conditions as pro se plaintiff is Brought, and have *anyone* of them, or *anyone in the world*, who Intel corporation can find who can Demonstrate for this District Court, the Actual Application of how the [Virtual Technology or Core 2 – DUO] actually works, if they (*can*) then as stated above, under the federal laws governing civil actions pro se plaintiff (*shall be*), if he fails to Demonstrate his *trade secret*, be held liable to the defendant(s) for **Ten Thousand Dollars** [\$10,000.00] and to this requirement pro se plaintiff is two hundred percent (200%) in agreement with this. **HOWEVER** when Intel Corporation **FAILS** to give a Demonstration, pro se plaintiff **DEMANDS** just compensation of **Five Billion dollars** [\$5,000,000,000.00] and any and all *Patents, copyrights, Trademarks, Monies, Money Contrasts, Transactions, Records and all Documentation, Agreements, Trades, Stocks, Bonds, and any other business conducted or engaged* in concerning the [Core 2 – DUO, and Virtual Technology] and **ALL MONEY PROFITS** made received and profited there form, once pro se plaintiff demonstrates

for this United States District Court the fact of his Ownership as the Original Inventor of these Technological commercially valuable products.

QUESTIONS OF LIABILITY

9) In assessing the question of liability pro se plaintiff first turns to the supreme law of the **LORD GOD OF HOST**, because these are in fact the very same Laws upon which this Land of America, and the United States was founded upon and herein will further serve to clarify when a person is liable for their actions, and further establishes When they do wrong without knowing it and when they Knowingly do wrong and continues to do so with little regard for the fact that the Act or Acts of the wrongful conduct violates the Laws governing them [Note: *This is not a legal argument*] but rather it is pro se plaintiff's intent to bring into focus grounds upon which relief may be Granted, and Monetary Damages Awarded, in that this is an extraordinary civil action created as allowed pursuant to **Title 28 USC § 2201**.

a) In **Romans Ch. 3, v. 19 & 20 THE LORD GOD OF HOST Declares**

v. 19 *Now we know that what things so ever the law saith, it saith to them to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped and all the world may become guilty before God.*

v. 20 *Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.*

b) So it follows that *liability* is upon to those who are under the *Law* and who have *knowledge* of it.

c) **Intel Corporation** is liable to pro se plaintiff because as a citizens of the United States, resident citizens of the State of Oregon, **Intel Corporation** operates and conduct it's

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
 Plaintiff in pro se
 SID No. 6242666
 777 Stanton Blvd
 Ontario, OR 97914

Business Transactions and affairs under the Laws enacted by the House of Congress of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Oregon, and the Oregon Administrative Rules, and Statutory Laws of the State of Oregon

d) Intel Corporation, in order to be incorporated, and to operate and conduct any Business Transaction or Affairs must first be Licensed, and Insured to do so, with Knowledge and understanding of the Laws governing Corporations and their Liabilities.

e) Pro se plaintiff has in fact communicated and established himself to **Intel Corporation** as the rightful owner and the original creator, inventor of the **[Core-2 Duo Micro Processor]**, and **[Virtual Technology]** that **Intel Corporation** has in fact been marketing and selling for monetary financial profit on the commerce and trade interstate commercial world market, with full knowledge and understanding that the technological products, merchandise goods, or property in controversy does in fact belong to pro se plaintiff, without pro se plaintiff's permission, authorization or consent to do so, and without ever once paying pro se plaintiff any monies, and or sharing any of the profits with pro se plaintiff, or offering pro se plaintiff any form of *just Compensation Stocks, Bonds, Shares, etc.*

STATEMENTS OF CLAIMS CAUSE OF ACTION

CLAIM I

10) In March or April of 2003, pro se plaintiff, sent a copy of the Designs and Schematics, of his intellectual property, a patentable invention, and copyrightable work, to wit; a ***Hacker proof, Virus proof*** Computer, with ***Multi phase Microprocessors***, which pro se plaintiff calls **[LANCELOT]**, for its impervious ability to being Hacked into and its ability to fight off Viruses, to **Steve Jobs**, at **Apple Computer**, in California, but did not send **Mr. Jobs**, the

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

proprietary information, which is the *Trade Secret*. See Attached Exhibits Marked **PRO SE PL.**

EX. 1.

a) Pro se plaintiff requested that **Mr. Jobs**, Help and Assistance him in developing and Marketing, his intellectual property patentable invention, or buy it from pro se plaintiff for **Two Hundred and Fifty Million Dollars** [\$ 250,000,000.00], and that upon receiving a contractual signed agreement, then pro se plaintiff would agree to sent to **Mr. Jobs**, the *Proprietary Information*, the *Trade Secrets* on how to make this computer Technology work.

b) **Steve Jobs**, never replied to pro se plaintiff.

CLAIM II

11) In the latter part of that same year, **2003**, **Steve Jobs**, took pro se plaintiff's *intellectual property* patentable inventions, to **Intel Corporation**. The exact nature and extent of the Agreement between **Mr. Jobs**, and **Intel Corporation** is not known to pro se plaintiff at this time.

a) It remains however a fact that **Mr. Steve Jobs**, *Defrauded Intel Corporation*, by not totally Disclosing to, and Informing **Intel Corporation** just where exactly he got it, and from whom he actually did get the *Designs* and *Schematics* for the **Dual-Core/ Core-2 Duo Microprocessor**, and **Virtual Technology**.

CLAIM III

12) In **June of 2006**, **Intel Corporation**'s senior vice president **Mr. Pat Gelsinger**, is seen being photographed in the Oregonian News Paper, Holding in his left hand, a computer mother board, which **Intel Corporation** later termed **Virtual Technology**. With the help of **EMC Corporation**'s **VMware Inc.** unit, who **Intel Corporation** paid **Two Hundred Eighteen**

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

Million Dollars,[\$ 218,000,000.00] to **HELP Intel Corporation**, to try figure out pro se plaintiff's *proprietary information, Trade Secrets*, See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL.**
EX. 2 & 6.

a) Pro se plaintiff can in fact come Before this U S District Court, and prove conclusively that the computer mother board, which **Mr. Gelsinger**, is holding in his hand, in the News Paper is in fact a product created and manufactured from pro se plaintiff's *intellectual property Design*, patentable invention, of [LANCELOT] the *Hacker proof, Virus Proof computer*. See Attached Exhibits Marked **PRO SE PL. EX.1.**

b) **Intel corporation** has publicly Announced that **Intel Corporation** rolled out the first dual-core microprocessor in the latter part of 2005, and in that same Public Announcement, stated that **Intel Corporation** is seeking **HELP** from *universities and programmers*, to **HELP Intel Corporation** [SOLVE the multithreading] problems that Intel cooks up. See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 3.** This is in fact an explicit **PLEA** from **Intel Corporation** *albeit an implicit PLEA* by **Intel Corporation** for any one to **HELP Intel Corporation** tries to figure out how to make this Technology work.

CLAIM IV

13) after learning that that computer microchips Grossed over **Two Hundred and Forty Six Billion Dollars** [\$ 246,000,000,000.00] world wide in 2006, pro se plaintiff In **February 2007**, sent to **Intel Corporation** a letter of acknowledgment and ownership of the [**Core-2 Duo Processor and Virtual Technology**], in which pro se plaintiff made certain demands, and placing certain restrictions, and obligations on any *Letters, Response, Reply, Communiqués*, or interacting *Missives*, to which **Intel Corporation** did in fact, in large part complied with, which

in turn was an Act by **Intel Corporation** establishing that **Intel Corporation's** does in fact Acknowledge that pro se plaintiff is the Rightful owner of, and original inventor and creator of the **[Dual core / Core-2 Duo Microprocessor, and the Virtual Technology]**.

a) In his Communiqué to **Intel Corporation**, Pro se plaintiff addressed **Intel Corporation** in this manner;

Dear Intel Corporation;

Does this look familiar? Well it should. It is the **Hacker Proof, Virus Proof Computer**, that I invented, which I Call **[LANCELOT]**. I showed it to **Steve Jobs**, at **Apple Computer**, and asked him for **Two Hundred and Fifty Million Dollars**, he took it to you at **Intel**, and you built it but you do not know how to turn it on.

So here is what you are going to do. You are going to Agree to pay me **Seventy Percent (70 %)** every thing that You Gross Off of it, and then I will tell you how to turn It on and make it do what I Designed it to do.

You have **30 days to Respond, on Bonded paper, with your Signature written in Blue ink**, or I am going to send copies Of my schematics to **AMD (Advance Micro Devices)** and Tell them how it works for next to nothing.

b) **Intel Corporation** responded exactly in the manner **DEMANDED** by pro se plaintiff, meeting the required conditions, and obligations placed on the Response by pro se plaintiff, See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. .**

c) Pro se plaintiff request that this U. S. District Court pay special Attention to the fact the even though, **Intel Corporation** did **not** agree to pay pro se plaintiff **Seventy Percent (70%)** **Intel Corporation** **Never** once **Denied** nor even tried to **Challenge** pro se plaintiff's position as the Rightful Owner, and Original Creator, and Inventor of the **Dual-Core Microprocessor**, and the **Computer mother board**, latter call **Virtual Technology**, seen being Held in the hand of

Intel Corporation's senior vice president Mr. Pat Gelsinger. See Attached Exhibit Marked PRO SE PL. EX. 4 & 7.

d) When Intel Corporation replied within Two and one half weeks, in the manner DEMANDED by pro se plaintiff, pro se plaintiff, wrote to Intel Corporation a second time, and in this *Communiqué* pro se plaintiff did not address Intel Corporation so harshly, and made Intel Corporation, what pro se plaintiff believed to be a *fair* proposition, which was stated to this effect;

Dear Intel Corporation:

Thank you for responding in the Manner that I requested,
And since you did it may not have been your fault and that you
may not have known that Steve Jobs lied to you, so here is my
Offer to you, Sign a Contractual Agreement with me where
Intel Corporation will agree to pay me Fifteen Percent (15%)
Of every thing that you make on my Hacker Proof, and Virus
Proof Computer [LANCELOT], and also *sign a Contractual
Agreement to manufacture build, and Market for me, my
Computer Chip Microprocessor,/[TRADWAY]*.
Please note that the SAME Conditions apply here, 30 days, with
Your signature in Blue ink on Bonded paper.

e) Intel Corporation Responded just as pro se plaintiff Requested, within Three (3) weeks, on Bonded paper, with the Signature in Blue ink. See Attached Exhibit Marked PRO SE PL. EX. 5,

f) Again pro se plaintiff Request that this U.S. District Court pay special attention to the fact that AGAIN Intel Corporation did not Challenge or Deny that pro se plaintiff is the Rightful owner of this Technology.

CLAIM V

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

a) According to various News Paper Publications, Intel Corporation has Made over Fifty Billion Dollars [\$ 50,000,000,000.00] profit off of pro se plaintiff's intellectual property patentable invention, which Intel Corporation calls [Core 2, Duo Processor] alone, and pro se plaintiff can not even guess how much Intel Corporation has made off of pro se plaintiff's intellectual property patentable invention, which Intel Corporation calls [Virtual Technology]

b) But HERE IS A FACTUAL CONTENTION, AND ISSUE AT LAW, AT COMMON LAW, Intel Corporation would NOT HAVE this Money, Profits, Stocks, Bonds, and position as the *Main supplier*, and *principal provider* of the Worlds *Computer Microchips*, HAD Steve Jobs NOT provided Intel Corporation, a copy of pro se plaintiff's Intellectual Property Designs, and Schematics from which Intel Corporation then manufactured the Dual Core Multiphase Microchip Processor.

c) Even after pro se plaintiff has CONCLUSIVELY PROVEN to Intel Corporation that he is in fact the Rightful Owner, and the Original Inventor of this Technology, Intel Corporation continues to violate pro se plaintiff's Constitutional, and Common Law Rights to enjoy the Fruits of his labor, Intel Corporation in its unfair trade practice, continues even after becoming aware that pro se plaintiff is the rightful owner, and original inventor of this technology, knowingly conceal, withhold, transfer in interstate commerce, sell on the world commercial market for the sole purpose of illegally profiting from pro se plaintiff's personal intellectual property patentable inventions, and copyrightable works without pro se plaintiff's approval, authorization, consent, and against pro se plaintiff's wants and desires, without being *Grateful* or *showing* any *consideration* to the fact that had it not been for pro se plaintiff's *intellectual property patentable invention designs and schematics*, Intel Corporation would

NOT be the *World leader* in computer microchips Today, **AMD (Advanced Micro Devices)**, or **Micron Technology** could have just as easily have been the *World Leader* in manufacturing computer microchip processors with pro se plaintiff's intellectual property patentable inventions. See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 7 & 10.**

RELIEF SOUGHT

THERFORE Pursuant to the United States Code Amendments cited above in this civil action, with emphasis at **Title 28 USC § 1343 (a) (1) (2) (3), and (4), § 1338, and § 2201**; This United States District Court has the Authority and needed Jurisdiction to Render Judgments, and Issue Orders directed at and to the parties here in this civil action, and to ORDER that an Extraordinary Hearing be Held, and Conducted wherein the parties must perform under seal record of this U S District Court a Demonstration of the Actual Trade Secrets the Proprietary Information pertaining to the Commercially Valuable Products called **Dual Core, Core 2 Duo** Micro Processor, and the Computer Technology called **Virtual Technology**.

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG, The Clamant Plaintiff proceeding in pro se, **DEMANDS** Just Compensation Awards in the Sum and Amount of **Five Billion Dollars**, **[\$ 5,000,000,000.00]** for the unauthorized use and profits made from pro se plaintiff's intellectual personal property patentable invention, and copyrightable works.


Pro se plaintiff further **DEMANDS** Compensatory Awards of ALL of the Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, Proceeds Monies, Stocks, Bonds, Securities, and Contracts, Agreements, and any and ALL Business **DEALS** made generated and or agreed to in regards to the Commercially Valuable Products called Core 2 Duo, and Virtual Technology.

Pro se plaintiff Request that this United States Court Issue and Injunction prohibiting

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

Intel Corporation its subsidiaries', Business partners, Associates, and or any person or Citizen within this Courts Jurisdiction to Order World wide from manufacturing, building, marketing, selling or otherwise pertaining to the Technology stated and mentioned in this civil action.

Executed on this 11 day of June, 2009


MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Pro se plaintiff

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signed and Dated this 11 Day of June, 2009


MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG

MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG
Plaintiff in pro se
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd
Ontario, OR 97914

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CASE NAME: Matthew R. Young v. Matthew R. YoungCASE NUMBER: (if known) CV-08-1496-BRCOMES NOW, Matthew R. Young, and certifies the following:That I am incarcerated by the Oregon Department of Corrections at 777 Stanton Blvd.
Ontario, OR 97904.That on the 18 day of June, 2009, I personally placed in the
Correctional Institution's mailing service A TRUE COPY of the following:Amended complaintI placed the above in a securely enclosed, postage prepaid envelope, to the person(s)
named at the places addressed below:Intel Corporation
2111 NE 25 Ave
Millsboro, OR 97124Matthew R. Young
(Signature)Print Name Matthew R. Young
S.I.D. No.: 76242666
777 Stanton Blvd.
Ontario, OR 97914